

REMARKS

The foregoing amendments and the following remarks are responsive to the Final Office Action mailed February 19, 2004. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application.

Claims 1-30 are pending. Claims 1, 2, 12, 25, 27, and 30 are amended. Therefore, claims 1-30 are presented for examination.

Claims 2 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite or failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. With respect to claim 2, the Examiner suggests that the broad range together with a narrow range is claimed. Applicants have amended claim 2, to clarify that these steps happen subsequently, and thus these limitations do not correspond to a "broad range narrow range" limitation. With respect to claim 30, Applicants have amended the claim, to provide proper antecedent basis for the limitations. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 27 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,256,623 issued to Jones and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,487,538 issued to Gupta, et al. Examiner rejected claims 3-11 and 28-29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,256,623 issued to Jones and U.S. Patent No. 6,487,538 issued to Gupta, et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,189,003 issued to Leal. Examiner rejected claims 12-26 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,487,538 issued to Gupta, et al.

Claim 1 recites:

A method comprising:
permitting a search;

displaying a search result, the search result comprising a listing of a sponsoree; and
incorporating a designated active and browseable web page of a sponsor on the same page as the search result, wherein if the wherein no further browsing is required to see a content of the web page; and
wherein the sponsoree remove the web page of the sponsor.

(Claim 1, as amended). None of the references teach or suggest the sponsoree being able to remove the web page of the sponsor. In fact, none of the references cited by the Examiner provide any ability for the sponsoree to edit in any way the advertising associated with their listings. Therefore, claim 1, as amended, and claims 2-11 which depend on it, are not obvious over the references cited.

Claim 12 similarly recites:

A method comprising:
permitting purchase a sponsorship of at least one listing based on a criteria; and
identifying a designated web page for incorporation on the same page as the listing when the sponsored listing is displayed as a search result, the designated web page being fully browseable to a user viewing the sponsored listing; and
enabling a listing owner to bump the sponsorship of the listing, and remove the web page of the sponsor.

(Claim 12). None of the references cited teach or suggest enabling a listing owner to bump the sponsorship of the listing, and remove the web page of the sponsor. Therefore, claim 12, as amended, and claims 13-24 which depend on it, are not obvious over the references.

Claim 25 similarly recites:

An apparatus for showing search results comprising:
a database including a plurality of searchable listee-sponsoree listings;
a user interface for receiving a search from a user;
a searching logic for searching the plurality or listee-sponsoree listings in response to the search;
a linking logic for linking a listee-sponsoree result of the search to a sponsor, the linking logic enabling the listee to remove the sponsor from the listing; and
the user interface for displaying data of the listee-sponsoree that is the result of the search and incorporating a designated fully navigable web page of the sponsor on the same page as the result.

(Claim 25). None of the references cited teach or suggest enabling the listee to remove the sponsor from the listing. Therefore, claim 25, as amended, and claim 26 which depends on it, is not obvious over the references.

Claim 27, as amended, recites:

A method comprising:
displaying data of a listee-sponsoree in response to a search; and
displaying an active web page of a sponsor associated with the
listee-sponsoree on the same page as the data of the listee-sponsoree,
such that the active web page is accessible while reviewing the data of the
listee-sponsoree, wherein no further browsing is required to see a content
of the web page.

(Claim 27). None of the references teach or suggest a system in which an active web page of a sponsor is displayed and in which no further browsing is required to see the content of the web page. The Examiner specifically notes that "Gupta discloses an advertising banner or icon may be an image, text, or an image with text that may have a hyperlink to the advertiser's web page, thus if a user clicks on an advertiser's banner, the user's browser will load the advertiser's web page. (Response to Arguments, page 13, quoting Gupta, column 4, lines 14-25). This is different from, and teaches away from displaying the active web page without requiring further browsing, i.e. requiring the user to click on the banner. Therefore, claim 27, as amended, is not obvious over the references, nor are claims 28-30 which depend on it.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Such allowance is respectfully requested.


If the Examiner finds any remaining impediment to the prompt allowance of these claims that could be clarified with a telephone conference, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Judith A. Szepesi at (408) 720-3000.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman LLP

Date: 4/19, 2004


Judith A. Szepesi
Reg. No, 39,393

12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025
(408) 720-8300